



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,502	12/13/2005	David Harold Drewry	PR60317USW	4610
23347	7590	10/02/2008	EXAMINER	
GLAXOSMITHKLINE CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MAI B482 FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398			RAO, DEEPAK R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USCIPRTP@GSK.COM  
LAURA.M.MCCULLEN@GSK.COM  
JULIE.D.MCFALLS@GSK.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/560,502	DREWRY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Deepak Rao	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,63-68 and 71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,63-68 and 71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                 |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application       |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20051213</u> .  | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Notice to Comply</u> . |

Art Unit: 1624

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-6, 63-68 and 71 are pending in this application.

#### *Specification*

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
2. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth below or on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures. Particularly, see experimental data in specification page 159, which contains sequences. (See attached notice to comply).

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1-6, 63-68 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a compound of Formula (I) or a salt thereof, does not reasonably provide enablement for a **solvate** or a **physiologically functional derivative** of the

Art Unit: 1624

compound of Formula (I). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

The instant claim recites “A compound ... or a salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivative thereof” wherein there is insufficient description in the specification regarding the types of ‘derivatives’ intended by the recitation. The recitation “physiologically functional derivative” is explained in the specification at page 20 – “physiologically functional derivative refers to any pharmaceutically acceptable derivative of a compound of the present invention, for example, an ester or an amide, which upon administration to a mammal is capable of providing (directly or indirectly) a compound of the present invention or an active metabolite thereof”. However, the specification does not provide what are some of the examples of “derivatives” intended by this recitation.

As explained in the specification, the recitation includes esters and amides of compounds of Formula (I). However, the definitions of various substituent groups in Formula (I) already include such groups, e.g., amides. The specification does not provide what other ‘compounds’ of the invention are intended to be the above referred “derivatives”. The generic formula of the claims already includes amides, etc., see e.g., see the term “-C(O)NR””, wherein R” is alkyl.

Art Unit: 1624

There is no disclosure regarding any other esters or amides that are capable of providing compounds of the invention. Further, specification does not provide sufficient explanation of the term “metabolite”. A metabolite is any compound which is pharmaceutically active *in vivo* when it undergoes “metabolic” process and the specification does not provide any disclosure of what these compounds might be that *in vivo* transform in to the instantly claimed compounds. The specification does not provide what other ‘compounds’ of the invention are intended to be metabolites. Since functional groups such as esters, amides, etc. are already included in the claimed compounds, it is not clear whether compounds bearing these groups are excluded from being a potential “physiologically functional derivatives” of the claimed invention. If compounds bearing these groups (i.e., amide, etc.), which are likely to undergo *in vivo* transformation, are excluded then what is included in the definition of the above term and where on the structural Formula (I) are these groups placed; the specification does not provide any direction to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Further, the specification has no working example of “solvate” of compound of Formula (I); and some of the exemplified compounds within the claimed genus were in contact with solvent. Yet they have not formed solvate as evident from spectral data provided for these compounds.

Searching the pertinent art in the related pyrimidine area did not result in support for such solvates of instant pyrimidine compounds. Searching the more general area of solvates resulted in pertinent reference West applied below. West clearly shows lack of predictability of the art in the solvate area.

Based on these two facts, a scope of enablement rejection follows using relevant Wands

Art Unit: 1624

factors. Hence, the burden of establishing the *prime facie* case is met with.

(i). **The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:**

Specification is not adequately enabled as to how to make solvate of compounds of Formula (I) Specification has no example of solvate of the instant compounds. Specification on page 16 recites that ‘solvate refers to a complex variety of variable stoichiometry formed by a solute and a solvent and solvents include water, methanol, ethanol or acetic acid’ but there is no enabling disclosure of such solvates.

The compound of Formula (I) embrace substituted pyrimidine compounds substituted with variable groups A, R<sup>1</sup>, R<sup>2</sup>, R<sup>3</sup>, etc. Careful calculation of the number of compounds embraced in the instant Formula (I) shows a large number of compounds and there is no teaching of any solvate of this large genus.

Search in the pertinent art, including water as solvent resulted in a pertinent reference, which is indicative of unpredictability of solvate formation in general. The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, “it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is the compositional extent”. Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. Compared

Art Unit: 1624

with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the solvate. In the instant case of solvate a similar reasoning therefore applies. Water is a solvent and hence it is held that a pertinent detail of West, which relates to solvates, is also applicable to water.

In addition, an additional search resulted in Vippagunta et al., Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews 48: 3-26, 2001, which clearly states that formation of solvates is unpredictable. See entire document especially page 18, right column section 3.4. Note Vippagunta et al., states “Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates or hydrates and hence generalizations cannot be made for series of related compounds”.

Joachim Ulrich (Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology) provides that “Pseudopolymorphs are solvates or in the case of water as solvent, hydrates, which means crystals that incorporate solvent molecules into the crystal lattice. Pseudopolymorphs exhibit different crystal forms and/or different densities, solubilities, dissolution rates, colors, hardnesses, etc. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom (than temperature and pressure), which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the pseudopolymorph”.

**(ii). The predictability or lack thereof in the art:**

Hence the solvate as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant are not art-recognized compounds and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

**(iii). The amount of direction or guidance present:**

Examples illustrated in the experimental section are limited to making the compounds not

Art Unit: 1624

related to solvates. There is no example of solvate of instant compound. Many of the exemplified compounds were shown in the specification that have come in contact with water and/or other solvent but there is showing that these compounds formed solvates. Hence it is clear that merely bringing the compound and water or solvent together does not result in solvate and additional direction or guidance is needed to make them - specification has no such direction or guidance.

**(iv). The presence or absence of working examples:**

There is no working example of any solvate formed. The claims are drawn to solvate, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate or even solvate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 “[T]he specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ... no evidence that such compounds even exist.” The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, there should be showing supporting that solvates of these compounds exists and therefore can be made.

**(v). The breadth of the claims & the quantity of experimentation needed:**

Specification provides no support, as noted above, for compounds generically embraced in the claim 1 would lead to desired solvate of the compound of Formula (I). As noted above, the genus embraces a large number of compounds and hence the claims are extremely broad. The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical



Art Unit: 1624

art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired solvate of compound of formula I embraced in the instant claims in view of the pertinent reference teachings.

2. Claims 68 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating rheumatoid arthritis, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of treating a disorder mediated by inappropriate ROCK-1 or Aurora kinase activity. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed. The determination that “undue experimentation” would have been needed to make and use the claimed invention is not a single, simple factual determination. Rather, it is a conclusion reached by weighing all the above noted factual considerations.

The instant claims 68 and 71 are drawn to ‘a method of treating a disorder in a mammal, mediated by inappropriate ROCK-1 or Aurora kinase activity’. The instant claims appear to be ‘reach through’ claims. Reach through claims, in general have a format drawn to mechanistic,

Art Unit: 1624

receptor binding or enzymatic functionality and thereby reach through any or all diseases, disorders or conditions, for which they lack written description and enabling disclosure in the specification thereby requiring undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the invention.

The specification at pages 1-6 provides that 'the compounds of the invention are useful in the treatment of disorders related to ROCK and Aurora kinase activity' and recites that 'the compounds of the invention can also be used in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis, certain forms of cancer, etc.'. As provided by the specification, the "therapeutic methods for the disorders" encompassed by the instant claims include 'treatment of cancer'. The claim language covers any and all types of disorders, which include various types of cancers or proliferative disorders. The instant claims cover 'cancer disorders' that are known to exist and those that may be discovered in the future, for which there is no enablement provided.

Test assays and procedures using Sf9 cells are provided in the specification pages 158-160, related to the inhibition of ROCK1 and Aurora A enzymes, and it is concluded that the 'the exemplified compounds showed inhibitory activity in terms of IC<sub>50</sub> of 5.0 or greater', however, there is nothing in the disclosure regarding how this *in vitro* data correlates to the treatment of all types of diseases mediated by inappropriate ROCK-1 or Aurora kinase activity or treatment of all types of cancers, etc. encompassed by the instant claims. The instant method includes all types of proliferative disorders such as cancer, leukemia, etc. some of which have been proven to be extremely difficult to treat. Further, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent and there is no basis in the prior

Art Unit: 1624

art for assuming the same. Note *In re Surrey*, 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group.

Further, there is no disclosure regarding how the patient in need of such specific kinase inhibiting activity is identified and further, how types of cancers are treated. See MPEP § 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure-specific arts such as the pharmaceutical art. Receptor activity is generally unpredictable and highly structure specific area, and the data provided of the single compound is insufficient for one of ordinary skill in the art in order to extrapolate to the other compounds of the claims. It is inconceivable as to how the claimed compounds can treat the extremely difficult diseases embraced by the instant claims. The state of the art is indicative of the unpredictability of the therapeutic approach based on kinase inhibiting activity.

The instant claims are drawn to ‘a method of treating cancer’. No compound has ever been found to treat proliferative disorders or cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a “silver bullet” is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states that, “each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study” (see the enclosed article, page 1004). A ‘disease caused by proliferation of tumor cell’ is anything that is caused by abnormal tissue growth. That can be growth by cellular proliferation more rapidly than normal, or continued growth after the stimulus that initiated the new growth has ceased, or lack (partial or complete) of structural organization and/or coordination with surrounding tissue. It can be benign or malignant. Thus, such term covers not only all cancers,

Art Unit: 1624

but also covers precancerous conditions such as lumps, lesions, polyps, etc. Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Also see *In re Buting*, 163 USPQ 689 (CCPA 1969), wherein ‘evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer, was held insufficient to establish the utility of the claims directed to disparate types of cancers’. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers or disorders caused by kinases generally.

Further, there is no established single antiproliferative therapeutic agent for all these types of diseases, which are characterized by the proliferation of tumor cells. The ideal chemotherapeutic drug would target and destroy only cancer cells without adverse effects or toxicities on normal cells. Unfortunately, no such drug exists; there is a narrow therapeutic index between cell kill of cancer cells and that of normal cells. Successful treatment of cancer requires elimination of all cancer cells, whether at the primary site, extended to local-regional areas, or metastatic to other regions of the body. The major modalities of therapy are surgery and radiotherapy (for local and local-regional disease) and chemotherapy (for systemic sites). For example, regarding the treatment of leukemia, The Merck Manual (online edition) states, that “Treatment programs and clinical situations are complex”. Dosage regimen is dependent on several risk factors and the contribution of each active ingredient of a multidrug combination therapy is complex and unclear.

Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, “the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of

Art Unit: 1624

unpredictability of the factors involved”. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(Only a few of the claimed diseases are discussed here to make the point of an insufficient disclosure, it does not definitely mean that the other diseases meet the enablement requirements). There is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disease(s) or disorder(s) claimed herein.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating a disorder mediated by inappropriate ROCK-1 or Aurora kinase activity.

2) The state of the prior art: There are no known compounds of similar structure which have been demonstrated to treat patients suffering from all types of disorders including cancer. In reference to cancer treatment using protein tyrosine kinase inhibitors, Traxler (Exp. Opin. Ther. Patents, 1997) stated that ‘pharmacological properties such as stability in biological media, bioavailability, metabolism or formulability are significant hurdles’ see page 585, col. 2, lines 33-36.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicant has not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant

Art Unit: 1624

compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, ‘the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved’. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: There are no doses present to direct one of ordinary skill in the art to use the compounds in the treatment of all of the diseases or disease symptoms within the scope of the claims. The specification provides (see pages 158-160) tests for the measurement of ROCK-1 or Aurora kinase inhibitory activity of the compounds. However, there is no disclosure regarding how this test data correlates to treatment of all types of diseases mediated by inappropriate ROCK-1 or Aurora kinase family, including all types of cancer.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace treating all types of diseases mediated by inappropriate ROCK-1 or Aurora kinases, including all types of cancer.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden, because it is not known what type of ‘diseases’ are referred to in the claims. Further, it would be an undue burden on one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the medical conditions or illnesses included in the instant claims.

Thus, factors such as “sufficient working examples”, “the level of skill in the art” and “predictability”, etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the use of the invention. In view of the breadth of the claim, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds, one having ordinary skill in the art would have

Art Unit: 1624

to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6, 63-68 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sehon et al., US PGPub No. 2008/0125427 (effective filing date: June 17, 2004). The instant claims read on reference disclosed compounds, see the compounds of formula (I) and the corresponding species of Examples # 4-6 (see page 15), etc. The compounds are disclosed to be useful as pharmaceutical therapeutic agents, see page 6.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

**Note:** Applicant’s claim for the priority benefit of Provisional Application 60/479,753 filed June 19, 2003 is acknowledged. Applicant can not rely on the priority benefit to overcome

Art Unit: 1624

the rejection because the Provisional Application does not fully disclose the instantly claimed invention, see for example, the definition of A which includes the group “ -CH<sub>2</sub>OCH<sub>2</sub>R” ” which is not present in the prior application.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6, 63-68 and 71 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 11/570,083. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims substantially overlap the compounds of the reference claims, see the claims in each of the application. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the compounds



Art Unit: 1624

from the reference claims and/or use the compounds in any of the methods taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled artisan would have had the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole i.e., as pharmaceutical therapeutic agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Receipt is acknowledged of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 13, 2005 and a copy is enclosed herewith.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Art Unit: 1624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**/Deepak Rao/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1624**

October 1, 2008